



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/545,288

04/07/2000

Stephane Ayala

1032326-000057

1602

21839 7590 07/13/2010
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

TRINH, MINH N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/13/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/545,288	Applicant(s) AYALA ET AL.	
	Examiner Minh Trinh	Art Unit 3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-24,27,29,45-50 and 52-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-12,27 and 29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 45 and 46 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,13 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The petition filed on 5/25/10 is granted. The final Office action of March 11, 2010 is hereby withdrawn in view of non Final Office action as follows.

Note that claims 1, 2, 4, 6-24, 27, 45-50, 52-56 are now pending in this application. Claims 6-12, 27 and 29 are nonelected w/drawn claims. Claims 47-50 and 52-53 (as amended) and newly added claims 54-56 (filed on 11/4/09) appear to be readable on the elected invention and are no longer w/drawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 47, 49, 50 and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidalgo (5,598,032) in view of Graumet et al (5640306).

Art Unit: 3729

Fidalgo discloses a method for manufacturing smart card having at least two antenna turns 5, a pair of connection pads 15 that are both disposed on a support sheet 3 on the common side of the antenna turns (note that both antenna turns and pads are on same side of the support sheet 3). Regarding the recitation of "wherein a conductive segment crosses over at least one turn of the at least two turns without creating a short circuit". The Graumet et al discloses such (see Fig. 4, which shows conductive segment 10 configured to cross over one turn 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the Fidalgo by incorporating the teaching of Graumet et al as so to form the support sheet having the interconnection above. The motivation for the combination can be obtained at col. 1, lines 29-54 of the Graumet et al.

Limitations of claims 2, 47-49 appear to be met by the combination teachings as discussed above. Note Regarding claim 48, wherein the antenna is incrustated on the support sheet as in this is old and well known in the art).

As applied to claim 50, refer to Graumet's Fig. 4, for the teaching of insulation bridge 9 on the face of support sheet 12 or 14, etc.,.

As applied to claim 52, Furthermore, col. 4, about lines 6-10 of the Fidalgo teaches the electrical interconnection of 5, 15 and contact zone 12 as pads, etc.

As applied to claims 52-56, noting the Fidalgo discloses substantially every aspect method limitations recited in these claims with the exception of " wherein conductive segment crosses over at least one turn of the at least two turns". This is taught by the Graumet et al (refer to Fig. 4, which shows conductive segment 10 configured to cross over one antenna turn 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3729

to modify the Fidalgo by the teaching of Graumet et al as noted above in order to obtain an assembly that including the above feature. The motivation for the combination can be obtained at col. 1, lines 29-54 of the Graumet et al.

Limitations of claims 53-56 are also satisfied by the combination of Fidalgo and Graumet et al (refer above discussion).

5. Claims 14 -23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidalgo /Graumet et al as applied and modified above.

As applied to claim 14, regarding the module is formed by a solder with a low melting point. As applied to claim 14, it is inherent that to use low melting solder for connection module to the antenna in order to protect the extremely heat that may damage to the forming device.

As applied to claims 15-20, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art to incorporate the use of particular materials as recited in these claims since it was known in the art that selecting a material from a host of group of available materials on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Regarding claims 21-23, since the material is not a part of the invention, therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired means for connection between the connection pads of the antenna and the conductive pads of the module including the use of grease charged, silicon gasket charged, and/or additional gold deposited by thermal compression since applicant has not disclosed that these features are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the

Art Unit: 3729

invention would perform equally well with the conventional bonding techniques as taught by either of the prior art references (i.e., see the discussion of Fidago at cols. 5-6).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Claims 4, 13 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 45-46 are allowed

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art references are cited for their teaching of method of manufacturing chip card or smart card devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3729

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mt
7/1/10

/Minh Trinh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729